

SAN JUAN PUBLIC LANDS

Draft Land Management Plan • Draft Environmental Impact Statement

VOLUME 1 ■ Draft Environmental Impact Statement



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR

Bureau of Land Management
Dolores, Columbine, and Pagosa Field Offices

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

U.S. Forest Service – Region 2
San Juan National Forest



PROPOSED ACTION LOCATION..... San Juan Public Lands
U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA),
United States Forest Service (USFS)
U.S. Department of the Interior (USDI),
Bureau of Land Management (BLM)

Archuleta, Conejos, Dolores, Hinsdale, La Plata, Mineral,
Montezuma, Montrose, Rio Grande, San Juan, San Miguel Counties,
Colorado.

LEAD AGENCIES..... USFS/BLM
San Juan Public Lands Center
15 Burnett Court
Durango, CO 81301

COOPERATING AGENCIES..... Montezuma County
Town of Rico

BLM RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL..... Sally Wisely, State Director
BLM Colorado State Office
2850 Youngfield Street
Lakewood, CO 80215

USFS RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL..... Rick Cables, Regional Forester
USDA Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Region
740 Simms Street
Golden, Colorado 80401

FOR INFORMATION, CONTACT..... Shannon Manfredi, Team Leader (970-385-1229)
Thurman Wilson, Assistant Center Manager (970-385-1246)

SEND COMMENTS TO..... San Juan Plan Revision
P.O. Box 162909
Sacramento, CA 95816-2909
FAX: 916-456-6724
ONLINE: <http://ocs.fortlewis.edu/forestPlan>

Important:

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) prohibits discrimination in all its programs and activities on the basis of race, color, national origin, age, disability, and, where applicable, sex, marital status, familial status, parental status, religion, sexual orientation, genetic information, political beliefs, reprisal, or because all or part of an individual's income is derived from any public assistance program. (Not all prohibited bases apply to all programs.)

Persons with disabilities who require alternative means for communication of program information (Braille, large print, audiotape, etc.) should contact the USDA's TARGET Center at (202) 720-2600 (voice and TDD). To file a complaint of discrimination, write to USDA, Director, Office of Civil Rights, 1400 Independence Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20250-9410, or call (800) 795-3272 (voice) or (202) 720-6382 (TDD). USDA is an equal opportunity provider and employer.

This Draft Land Management Plan (DLMP) and Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) addresses future management options for approximately 1,867,800 acres of the San Juan National Forest, administered by the USFS; and approximately 500,000 surface acres and 300,000 acres of subsurface mineral estate administered by the BLM. The planning area is located in southwestern Colorado, in Archuleta, Conejos, Dolores, Hinsdale, La Plata, Mineral, Montezuma, Montrose, Rio Grande, San Juan, and San Miguel Counties. The BLM and the USFS in southwest Colorado are managed under a combined “Service First” partnership. The San Juan Public Lands Center (SJPLC) and its Ranger District/Field Offices (Columbine, Dolores, and Pagosa) are the joint USFS/BLM Service First offices responsible for the management of the public lands and resources considered in this DLMP/DEIS. Information provided by the public; BLM and USFS personnel; other Federal, State, and local governmental agencies; Native American tribal agencies and organizations; and special interest and community organizations has been used to develop and analyze the four land management alternatives and the oil and gas leasing alternatives considered in detail in this document. Alternative A, the No-Action Alternative, represents the continuation of current management direction. Alternative B, the Preferred Alternative, which is described in detail in Volume 2 of this DLMP/DEIS, provides for a mix of multiple-use activities, with a primary emphasis on maintaining most of the large, contiguous blocks of undeveloped lands and enhancing various forms of recreation opportunities while, at the same time, maintaining the diversity of uses and active forest and rangeland vegetation management. Alternative C provides for a mix of multiple-use activities, with a primary emphasis on preserving the undeveloped character of the San Juan public lands. Alternative D provides for a mix of multiple-use activities, with a primary emphasis on preserving the “working forest and rangelands” character of the lands administered by the SJPLC in order to produce the highest amounts of commodity goods and services. Additionally, these alternatives, plus a no-leasing alternative, are described as part of the USFS oil and gas leasing availability analysis.

USFS MISSION STATEMENT

The phrase, “Caring For The Land And Serving People,” captures the USFS mission, which is to sustain the health, diversity, and productivity of the nation’s forests and grasslands in order to meet the needs of present and future generations. As set forth in law, the USFS mission is to achieve quality land management under the sustainable multiple-use management concept in order to meet the diverse needs of people.

BLM MISSION STATEMENT

The BLM is responsible for the balanced management of BLM-administered lands and resources, and their various values, so that they are considered in a manner and combination that best serves the needs of the American people. Management is based upon the principles of multiple use and sustained yield. This combination of uses takes into account the long-term needs of future generations for renewable and non-renewable resources. These resources include recreation, range, timber, minerals, watershed, fish and wildlife, as well as wilderness and natural, scenic, scientific, and cultural values.

This document is presented in three volumes, and is consistent with all applicable Federal requirements guiding the preparation of a Draft Land Management Plan (DLMP) and a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS).

Volume 1 provides a detailed description of the planning analysis of the DEIS, which includes:

- **Executive Summary:** The Executive Summary provides a brief overview of discussions that are detailed in the full document. It serves as a synopsis of the planning process, as well as of the purpose and need, the issues, and the alternatives resulting from the planning process.
- **Chapter 1 - Purpose and Need:** This chapter offers a brief history and background of the management area. It describes the lead agencies (the USFS and the BLM) responsible for the overall planning and management of the San Juan public lands. It describes the purpose and need for the action, the scoping process and issues, planning criteria, the planning process, related plans and relevant policy, and the overall vision of this DLMP/DEIS.
- **Chapter 2 - Alternatives:** This chapter describes potential management approaches or “alternatives” and discusses the alternative development process. Four land management alternatives for managing the San Juan Public Lands are evaluated in detail in this DLMP/DEIS, including the No-Action Alternative (Alternative A) and the agencies Preferred Alternative (Alternative B). Additionally, the oil and gas leasing availability alternatives are described in detail in this chapter, including the no leasing alternative.
- **Chapter 3 - Affected Environment/Environmental Consequences:** This chapter describes the current physical, biological, human, and land use environments of the management area (the affected environment). This description provides a baseline against which to compare the impacts of the alternatives. The baseline described in this Chapter represents environmental and social conditions and trends in the planning area at the time this document was being prepared. In addition, this chapter evaluates how, and to what extent, baseline conditions may be altered (impacted) by the alternatives (the environmental consequences). These changes are measured in terms of adverse and beneficial impacts, direct and indirect impacts, and individual and cumulative impacts.
- **Chapter 4 - Preparers:** This chapter presents the names and qualifications of the people responsible for preparing this DLMP/DEIS.
- **Chapter 5 - References:** This chapter provides full citation information for all references, published and unpublished, cited in this document, as well as a glossary of terms used to explain natural resource concepts and management activities specific to this DLMP/DEIS.

Volume 2 provides a detailed description of Alternative B, the Preferred Alternative. This Draft Land Management Plan is formatted into three interrelated parts:

- **Part 1 – Vision:** This part sets the context for the Plan and describes the San Juan Public Land’s uniqueness on a regional and national level. It also describes the roles and contributions of the San Juan Public Lands and presents the desired conditions at several geographic scales. The vision is long-term and reflects ecological timeframes as well as social desires. In BLM planning terms, the vision includes desired outcomes and goals. In USFS planning terms, it includes goals and management area direction.

- **Part 2 – Strategy:** This part articulates how the BLM and Forest Service intend to move the San Juan Public Lands toward the desired conditions described in Part 1. The strategy is organized into four sections: objectives, suitable uses, special areas, and monitoring. In BLM planning terms, the strategy includes objectives; uses or allocations that are allowable, restricted or prohibited; some management actions (administrative designations and actions to achieve desired outcomes); and monitoring. In USFS planning terms, it includes objectives, suitability and capability, management area prescriptions, recommendations for the Secretary of Agriculture to take to Congress, and monitoring.
- **Part 3 – Design Criteria:** This part identifies the sideboards for the strategy as well as for subsequent projects designed to implement the strategy. In addition to specific standards and guidelines, this section includes references to other applicable guidance that the BLM and Forest Service use during project planning and implementation. The other guidance includes applicable Federal laws and regulations, Executive Orders (EOs), directives (manuals and handbooks), and State and local laws and regulations. In BLM planning terms the design criteria include some management actions (proactive measures and measures or criteria applied to guide day-to-day activities occurring on public land). In USFS planning terms, the design criteria include standards and guidelines.

Volume 3 provides the appendices and additional supporting information for the overall DLMP/DEIS, which some readers may find helpful when reviewing the main text of the document.

NOTE: Potential decisions and/or other discussions contained in this document may refer directly to maps and figures. In fact, many potential decisions themselves are “map-based.” Therefore, the reader may rely on the text, maps, and figures, taken together as a whole, in order to fully understand the potential decisions described for each alternative.

HOW TO COMMENT ON THIS DOCUMENT

The Environmental Protection Agency’s Notice of Availability (NOA) published in the Federal Register, initiates a 90-day public review and comment period. During this period, comments may be submitted using one of the following methods:

Via Website at: <http://ocs.fortlewis.edu/forestPlan>

By FAX to: 916-456-6724

By mail to: San Juan Plan Revision
P.O. Box 162909
Sacramento, CA 95816-2909

Reviewers should provide their comments to the USFS and BLM during the review period of the draft environmental impact statement. This will enable the USFS and BLM to analyze and respond to the comments at one time and to use information acquired in the preparation of the final environmental impact statement, thus avoiding undue delay in the decisionmaking process. Reviewers have an obligation to structure their participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process so that it is meaningful and alerts the agency to the reviewers' position and contentions. *Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corp. v. NRDC*, 435 U.S. 519, 553 (1978). Environmental objections that could have been raised at the draft stage may be waived if not raised until after completion of the final environmental impact statement. *City of Angoon v. Hodel* (9th Circuit, 1986) and *Wisconsin Heritages, Inc. v. Harris*, 490 F. Supp. 1334, 1338 (E.D. Wis. 1980). Comments on the draft environmental impact statement should be specific and should address the adequacy of the statement and the merits of the alternatives discussed (40 CFR 1503.3).

TIPS FOR REVIEWING AND COMMENTING ON THIS DOCUMENT

Some questions you may want to consider while reading this document include:

- Does the Preferred Alternative provide for the uses and/or the activities you consider to be the most important and relevant in the San Juan public lands planning area? If not, why not?
- Does the Preferred Alternative adequately protect the values, resources, and/or conditions that you consider to be the most important in the San Juan public lands planning area? If not, why not?
- Is there new or additional information that you believe would have a bearing on the analysis? If so, what specifically?
- Do you believe that the USFS/BLM needs to clarify any of the potential decisions? If so, which ones?

To be most helpful, comments should be as specific as possible and address the adequacy of the document or the merits of the alternatives. It is also helpful if comments refer to specific chapters and pages of the DLMP/DEIS.

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT CONSIDERATIONS

Public comments submitted during this planning review, including names and street addresses of respondents will be available for public review at the San Juan Public Lands Center during regular business hours (8 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, except holidays). Before including your address, phone number, e-mail address, and/or other personal identifying information in your comment, be advised that your entire comment – including your personal identifying information – may be made publicly available at any time. Only individual respondents may request confidentiality. If you wish to withhold your name or address from public review or from disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), you must state this prominently at the beginning of your comments. Such requests will be honored to the extent allowed by law; however, there is no guarantee that we will be able to honor this request. All submissions from organizations or businesses, or from individuals identifying themselves as representatives or officials of organizations or businesses, will be made available for public inspection in their entirety.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

If you would like to have your name added to the mailing list, or if you would like to view and download the DLMP/DEIS in Portable Document Format (PDF), please go to the project website at: <http://ocs.fortlewis.edu/forestPlan>. Copies of the DLMP/DEIS are also available at the following government offices during regular business hours:

- the Columbine Ranger District/Field Office, 367 Pearl Street, Bayfield, CO 81122 (970-884-2512);
- the Dolores Public Lands Office, 29211 Highway 184, Dolores, CO 81323 (970-882-7296);
- the Pagosa Springs Ranger District/Field Office, 180 Pagosa Street, Pagosa Springs, CO 81147 (970-264-2268);
- the BLM Colorado State Office, 2850 Youngfield Street, Lakewood, CO 80215; and
- the USDA Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Region, 740 Simms Street, Golden, CO 80401.

Copies are also available in some public libraries, including those in:

- Cortez, Colorado;
- Durango, Colorado;
- Pagosa Springs, Colorado;
- Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colorado;
- University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado; and
- Fort Lewis College, Durango, Colorado.

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA, 42 USC 4321 et seq.), the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (RPA), as amended by the National Forest Management Act of 1976, (NFMA, Sec. 6, 16 USC 1600.), and the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (FLPMA, 43 USC 1701 et seq.), the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and the U.S. Forest Service (USFS), in southwest Colorado, in cooperation under a “Service First” partnership, have prepared a Draft Land Management Plan/Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DLMP/DEIS) for the public lands under their jurisdiction. The San Juan Public Lands Center (SJPLC), and its Ranger District/Field Offices (Columbine, Dolores, and Pagosa), are the joint USFS/BLM Service First office responsible for the management of the public lands and resources considered in this DEIS/DLMP. In fulfillment of these, as well as all other legal, regulatory, and policy requirements, this DLMP/DEIS documents the comprehensive analysis of alternatives and environmental impacts for the planning and management of public lands and resources administered by the SJPLC exclusive of the Canyons of the Ancients National Monument which has a stand alone Resource Management Plan being developed.

The purpose, or goal, in developing this DLMP/DEIS is to ensure that USFS- and BLM-administered lands, resources, and mineral estate are managed in accordance with applicable laws, as well as with the principles of multiple use and sustained yield. The public lands in this administrative area, although under the care and management of the USFS and the BLM, belong to the American people; thus, it is the overriding goal of these agencies to actively seek out, engage, and include the public, and all other interested parties, in this planning process--a process that could shape how visitors perceive, experience, use, and enjoy their public lands. The USFS and the BLM encourage the public to review and comment on the DLMP/DEIS, and to raise concerns, if any, about proposed management.

THE PLANNING AREA

The planning area discussed in this DLMP/DEIS is located in southwestern Colorado, in Archuleta, Conejos, Dolores, Hinsdale, La Plata, Mineral, Montezuma, Montrose, Rio Grande, San Juan, and San Miguel Counties. The western border of the planning area is the Utah/Colorado State line. The southern border of the planning area is the New Mexico/Colorado State line. The eastern border is the Continental Divide. The northern border is the administrative boundaries of the Rio Grande, Gunnison, Grand Mesa, and Uncompahgre National Forests, and the BLM Uncompahgre Field Office. This DLMP/DEIS will provide a framework to guide future management decisions on approximately 1,867,800 acres of the San Juan National Forest, administered by the USFS, and approximately 500,000 surface acres and 300,000 acres of subsurface mineral estate administered by the BLM.

THE EXISTING BLM/USFS LAND MANAGEMENT PLANS

The San Juan Public Lands are currently being managed under the following land use plans:

- ***The San Juan/San Miguel Resource Management Plan (BLM 1985)***: The current Resource Management Plan (RMP) was approved in 1985, and has been amended five times. It provides management direction for what is now the SJPLC and its four Field Offices: Dolores, Columbine, Pagosa, Canyons of the Ancients National Monument (CANM). A separate RMP is being prepared for CANM).
- ***The San Juan National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan (USFS 1983)***: The current San Juan National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan (also known as a Forest Plan) was approved in 1983, with a major amendment in 1992 and twenty additional amendments. This DLMP/DEIS has been prepared using the provisions of the 1982 planning rule (36 CFR 219), as provided by the 2004 interpretative rule that clarified the transition provisions of the planning rule adopted on November 9, 2000. The current 1983 plan provides direction for the San Juan National Forest and its three Ranger Districts: Dolores, Columbine and Pagosa.

MANAGEMENT ALTERNATIVE GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

Four land management alternatives, and their associated environmental impacts and related issues, are described and analyzed in this document. Additionally, oil and gas leasing alternatives, including the no lease alternative, are described and analyzed. The alternatives reflect a reasonable range of potential management actions, based on the Analysis of the Management Situation (AMS); Federal, State, local, and other governmental agency input and consultation; Native American tribal agency input and consultation; and public scoping. The alternatives in this DLMP/DEIS seek to fully address the changing needs of the planning area, with the goal of selecting a management strategy that best achieves an effective combination of management actions, including one that:

- addresses all of the BLM-administered and USFS-administered public lands and resources administered by the SJPLC (exclusive of CANM);
- employs a community-based planning approach that complies with all applicable local, State, Federal, and Native American tribal laws, standards, policies, and implementation plans, as well as with all BLM and USFS policies, guidelines, and regulations;
- recognizes all valid existing rights;
- complies with the FLPMA, the NFMA, the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), and all other applicable laws, rules, regulations, standards, policies, and guidelines;
- coordinates and consults with Native American tribes in order to identify sites, areas, and/or objects important to their cultural and religious heritages;
- identifies management actions and allowable uses anticipated to achieve the established goals and objectives, and to reach the desired outcomes;
- provides comprehensive management direction by serving as a basis for land use decisions for all appropriate resources and resource uses administered by the SJPLC;
- establishes goals and objectives (desired outcomes) for managing resources and resource values according to the principles of multiple use and sustained yield;
- identifies land use planning decisions that will serve to guide future land management actions and subsequent site-specific implementation decisions;

- considers current scientific information, research, new technologies, as well as the results of relevant resource assessments, monitoring, and coordination;
- considers current and potential future uses of the public lands and resources administered by the SJPLC through the development of reasonable foreseeable future developments and activity scenarios based on historical, existing, and projected levels of use;
- recognizes the Nation's needs for domestic sources of minerals, food, timber, and fiber, and incorporates the requirements of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act Reauthorization, the Energy Policy Act, the National Fire Plan, the Healthy Forest Restoration Act, and the Healthy Forest Initiative;
- retains flexibility so that the USFS and BLM can adapt to new and emerging issues and opportunities, and provide for adjustments to decisions over time, based on new information and monitoring; and
- strives to be compatible with existing plans and policies of adjacent local, State, Federal, and Native American tribal agencies, consistent with Federal law, regulations, and BLM and USFS policy.

ISSUES

Planning issues identify demands, concerns, and/or conflicts regarding the use or management of public lands and resources. These issues typically express potential impacts on land and on resource values. The main topic areas addressed in this DLMP/DEIS were identified based on input from interagency consultation, State government, cooperating agencies, internal review, as well as input from the public, industry representatives, and special interest groups. The identified issues represent the challenges that exist with current management and with the current BLM and USFS land management plans. The SJPLC has documented each of the issues in a scoping report.

The public scoping process invited interested parties to comment on, and contribute input with regard to, the planning process. On September 23, 1999, a Notice of Intent (NOI) to revise the USFS Land Management Plan (LMP) for the San Juan National Forest was published in the Federal Register. On December 14, 2004, a second NOI was published, updating timelines and informing all interested parties that the BLM Resource Management Plan (RMP) would be revised concurrently.

Four main issues drove the development of alternatives for this DLMP/DEIS. The alternatives reflect where people had notably different ideas about how to manage and/or how to use different areas administered by the SJPLC. These different ideas came from the community study groups, web-based interaction, as well as from scoping meetings, written comments, and other scoping activities. These issues include the following:

- ***Issue One - Balancing Management Between the Ideas of Maintaining "Working Forests and Rangelands" and of Retaining "Core Undeveloped Lands"***: Here, issues and concerns included balancing the concepts of a "working forest and rangelands" (respecting valid and existing rights to resources, retaining access and commodity production activities that are important to the economy of local communities, and continuing historical uses in areas where access and infrastructure investments have already been made) with that of retaining "core undeveloped areas" (retaining areas that have not been developed in order to provide high-quality wildlife habitat and corridors, minimize ecosystem fragmentation, and support natural ecosystem functions). Maintaining the roadless character of much of the public lands in the planning area was identified as important by wildlife managers, sportsmen, and by many interested citizens.

- **Issue Two - Providing Recreation and Travel Management Within a Sustainable Ecological Framework:** Here, issues and concerns included the need to find a balance between the way long-time residents, new arrivals, and visitors use the public lands with regard to recreation and travel management. Opinions were divided on where to emphasize motorized travel versus non-motorized travel. Issues and concerns also included the appropriate mix of different kinds of recreation settings and opportunities that should be provided on public lands in the planning area.
- **Issue Three - Management of Special Areas and Unique Landscapes:** Here, issues and concerns include debate about which areas should be recommended for special designations and/or managed in order to emphasize unique features. Special designations would include Forest Service wilderness recommendations, suitability of rivers for Congressional designation into the Wild and Scenic Rivers System, Research Natural Areas, Areas of Critical Environmental Concern, botanical, archaeological, and habitat areas, scenic, historic and backcountry byways, and national, recreation and scenic trails. Issues and Concerns also included alternative ways of managing some unique landscapes, including the Dolores River Canyon, Silverton, Rico, McPhee and the HD Mountains.
- **Issue Four - Managing Impacts from oil and Gas Leasing and Development:** Here, issues and concerns included providing for potential energy development while, at the same time, protecting other resource values. People expressed concern with both where and how development might occur.

ALTERNATIVES

Land use planning regulations and NEPA require the USFS and the BLM to develop a range of reasonable alternatives during the planning process. The basic goal of developing alternatives is to prepare different combinations of management scenarios in order to address all identified issues and to resolve conflicts among uses. Alternatives must meet the purpose and need; must be reasonable; must provide a mix of resource protection, use, and development; must be responsive to the issues; and must meet the established planning criteria (See Volume 1, Chapter 2). The alternatives proposed for this DLMP/DEIS were developed with varying Management Area (MA) allocations and objectives in order to focus on resolving these issues and concerns (see Table 1). Additionally, oil and gas leasing availability alternatives are described in detail, including the no leasing alternative, and are described for both FS and BLM administered resources to accommodate both USFS and BLM leasing availability requirements and decision making authorities.

A number of other alternatives were considered, but were not analyzed in detail (See Volume 1, Chapter 2). Each of the alternatives proposed for this DLMP/DEIS provides a framework for multiple-use and sustained-yield management of the full spectrum of resources, resource uses, and programs present in the planning area. The alternatives analyzed in this DLMP/DEIS represent a reasonable range in management actions and each has a different blend or balance of resource allocations and protections, resource uses, and potential impacts, as summarized below:

- **Alternative A:** Alternative A, the No-Action Alternative, is the continuation of present management under the existing BLM and USFS land management plans. This alternative meets the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (40 CFR Part 1502.14) that a no-action alternative be considered (“no-action” means that current management practices based on existing land use plans and other management decision documents would continue.) This alternative would serve as a baseline for comparing the impacts of the other alternatives. Direction from existing laws, regulation, and policy would also continue to be implemented. Under this Alternative, the current levels of products, services, and outputs of multiple-use and sustained-yield management of the public lands and resources administered by the SJPLC would continue, except for fluctuations due to budget. Activities such as timber harvesting and oil and gas development would potentially occur over a greater percentage of the planning area under Alternative A than they would under the other alternatives.
- **Alternative B:** Alternative B, the Preferred Alternative, would provide for a mix of multiple-use activities, with a primary emphasis on maintaining most of the large, contiguous blocks of undeveloped lands and on enhancing various forms of recreation opportunities while, at the same time, maintaining the diversity of uses and active forest and rangeland vegetation management. Alternative B is focused on balancing the ideas of maintaining “working forest and rangelands” and of retaining “core, undeveloped lands.” Uses and activities that require roads, such as timber harvesting and oil and gas development, would be focused in areas that already have roads. Relatively undeveloped areas and areas that currently do not have roads would, for the most part, remain that way. This alternative would represent a mix and a variety of actions that would resolve the issues and management concerns raised during public scoping, in consideration of all of the resource values and all of the management programs. (Alternative B, the Preferred Alternative, is described in detail in Volume 2 of the DLMP/DEIS.)
- **Alternative C:** Alternative C would provide for a mix of multiple-use activities, with a primary emphasis on the undeveloped character of the lands and resources administered by the SJPLC. Production of goods from vegetation management would continue, but might be secondary to other non-commodity objectives. Under Alternative C, production of goods and services would be slightly more constrained than that proposed under Alternatives A, B, and D. And, in some cases and in some areas, uses would be excluded in order to protect sensitive resources. Management provisions under this alternative would emphasize retaining the undeveloped character of large blocks of contiguous land and non-motorized recreational activities to a greater degree than would any of the other alternatives.
- **Alternative D:** Alternative D would provide for a mix of multiple-use activities, with a primary emphasis on the “working forest and rangelands” concept in order to produce the highest amounts of commodity goods and services, when compared with the other alternatives. Similar to Alternative A, this alternative would allow the greatest extent of resource use within the planning area while, at the same time, maintaining ecosystem management principles in order to protect and sustain resources. Under this alternative, potential impacts to sensitive resource values would be mitigated on a case-by-case basis.
- **No Leasing Alternative:** The no-leasing alternative is analyzed in compliance with 36 CFR 228.102(c)(2)&(3) which requires the Forest Service, when considering oil and gas leasing, to analyze an alternative of not leasing. Under this alternative acres not already withdrawn by law from leasing would be administratively not available for leasing. Under this alternative, only existing leases would continue to be developed. Any new leases would be deferred, pending a new analysis and decision (See Table 2).

Table 1 - Comparison of Land Allocations by Alternative

MANAGEMENT AREAS		Alternative A (No-Action Alternative)	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
MA 1	Natural Processes Dominate ¹	538,658	652,307	1,080,606	553,786
MA 2	Special Areas and Unique Landscape Areas	100,755	193,503	198,512	151,040
MA 3	Natural Landscape with Limited Management	891,718	825,000	472,022	788,289
MA 4	High-Use Recreation Emphasis	148,465	79,711	54,765	86,236
MA 5	Active Management (commodity production in order to meet multiple-use goals)	675,014	529,413	487,299	682,632
MA 7	Public and Private Lands Intermix	0	81,756	71,929	89,116
MA 8	Highly Developed Areas	14,475	7,395	3,952	17,986
Total Acres		2,369,085	2,369,085	2,369,085	2,369,085

¹ Under all of the alternatives, MA 1 would include 420,522 acres that are currently designated as Wilderness (Lizard Head, South San Juan, and Weminuche); 60,341 acres in the Piedra Area that are currently managed in order to maintain Wilderness characteristics, as directed by the 1993 Colorado Wilderness Act; and 55,428 acres of BLM Wilderness Study Areas.

Table 2 - Oil and Gas Leasing Availability by Alternative on USFS and BLM Lands

Oil and Gas Leasing Availability on San Juan Public Lands	Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B (Preferred)	Alternative C	Alternative D	No Lease Alternative
San Juan National Forest Fluid-Minerals - Oil and Gas (acres)					
Acres Withdrawn From Leasing	480,953	480,953	480,953	480,953	480,953
Acres Proposed for Withdrawal	0	67,726	532,957	0	0
Acres Administratively Not Available for Leasing	0	20,371	20,371	20,371	1,392,474
Acres Available for Leasing	1,392,474	1,304,377	839,146	1,372,103	0
No Surface Occupancy (NSO)	1,705	741,524	278,232	810,994	0
Controlled Surface Use (CSU)	169,485	248,636	265,420	235,850	0
CSU and Timing Limitations (TL)	559	77,176	73,089	69,843	0
Timing Limitations	1,390	69,935	67,826	71,693	0
Standard Lease Terms	1,219,355	167,106	154,579	183,723	0
BLM Fluid-Minerals - Oil and Gas (acres) <i>(figures are based on total mineral estate, including private surface)</i>					
Acres Withdrawn From Leasing	0	0	0	0	0
Acres Proposed for Withdrawal	0	0	0	0	0
Acres Administratively Not Available for Leasing	63,851	72,867	98,450	72,867	768,625
Acres Available for Leasing	704,804	695,758	670,175	695,758	0
No Surface Occupancy (NSO)	39,036	238,578	239,413	233,005	0
Controlled Surface Use (CSU)	201,022	55,286	55,153	56,947	0
CSU and Timing Limitations (TL)	57,641	12,762	12,521	15,831	0
Timing Limitations	113,915	264,019	238,095	264,782	0
Standard Lease Terms	293,160	125,113	124,993	125,194	0

ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

Volume 1, Chapter 3 of this DLMP/DEIS describes the environmental consequences that could result from the varying mix of land allocations (management area) and management emphasis of the alternatives. In Chapter 3 potential beneficial/adverse consequences are analyzed and discussed for each resource and program area.

Potential environmental impacts vary by projected outputs levels of management activities such as oil and gas development, timber harvest, road construction/reconstruction, fuel treatments, livestock grazing, recreation use (including mode of travel). To varying degrees across the alternatives, uses and activities would be affected by special designations including, but not limited to, areas recommended for Wilderness, Research Natural Areas, Areas of Critical Environmental Concern, Botanical Areas, and Archeological Areas.

Alternatives A and D place the most emphasis on commodity production; have the most land in MA 5, and the least restrictions on activities. This would probably result in higher levels of ground disturbance with more potential impacts to soil and water resources, wildlife and fisheries habitat, air quality, and scenery. Alternatives A and D also provide more opportunities for motorized recreation, with more potential conflicts with nonmotorized recreation. Alternatives A and D also result in higher levels of employment, income, revenues to State and local governments, and net revenues than the other alternatives.

Alternative C places the most emphasis on maintaining the undeveloped character of the area and has the most land in MA 1; has the largest acreages recommended for Wilderness, Research Natural Areas, Wild and Scenic Rivers, and other special designations. It has the lowest levels of commodity production and the most restrictions on activities. This would probably result in the lowest levels of ground disturbance with the least potential impacts to soil and water resources, wildlife and fisheries habitat, air quality, and scenery. Alternative C provides the most opportunities for nonmotorized recreation, with the fewest opportunities for motorized recreation. Alternative C would result in lower levels of employment, income, revenues to State and local governments, and net revenues than the other LMP alternatives (the no leasing alternative would have even lower levels).

Alternative B emphasizes a balance between commodity production and maintaining the undeveloped character of the area. It also emphasizes management of a number of unique landscapes for their special characteristics. It would probably result in lower levels of ground disturbance with less potential impacts to soil and water resources, wildlife and fisheries habitat, air quality, and scenery than under Alternatives A and D, but more than under Alternative C. Alternative B provides the most balance between motorized and nonmotorized recreation. Alternative B resolves the most potential conflicts among users of the San Juan Public Lands.

The No Lease Alternative would result in the lowest level of ground disturbance associated with oil and gas development with the fewer potential impacts to soil and water resources, wildlife and fisheries habitat, air quality, and scenery. It would result in lower levels of employment, income, revenues to State and local governments, and net revenues.

SECTION	PAGE
CHAPTER 1 ■ PURPOSE AND NEED	
1.1 INTRODUCTION	1.1
1.2 OVERVIEW OF THE DLMP/DEIS	1.5
1.3 THE EXISTING BLM/USFS LAND MANAGEMENT PLANS	1.7
1.4 THE PLANNING PROCESS	1.10
1.5 PURPOSE AND NEED	1.14
1.6 SCOPING PROCESS	1.16
1.7 POLICY	1.19
CHAPTER 2 ■ ALTERNATIVES	
2.1 INTRODUCTION	2.1
2.2 CHAPTER OVERVIEW	2.2
2.3 DEVELOPMENT OF ALTERNATIVES	2.4
2.4 IMPORTANT POINTS COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES	2.6
2.5 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT ELIMINATED FROM DETAILED ANALYSIS	2.8
2.6 GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THE ALTERNATIVES	2.11
2.7 DESCRIPTION OF THE LMP ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED IN DETAIL	2.22
2.8 DESCRIPTION OF THE OIL AND GAS LEASING AVAILABILITY ALTERNATIVES	2.44
2.9 COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES TABLES	2.66
2.10 SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES	2.81
CHAPTER 3 ■ AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES	
3.0 INTRODUCTION	3.1
3.1 AIR QUALITY	3.8
3.2 SOILS	3.29
3.3 WATER	3.37
3.3 AQUATIC ECOSYSTEMS AND FISH SPECIES	3.59
3.5 RIPARIAN AREA AND WETLAND ECOSYSTEMS	3.77
3.6 TERRESTRIAL ECOSYSTEMS AND PLANT SPECIES	3.84
3.7 SPECIAL BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY FEATURES	3.109
3.8 FIRE AND FUELS	3.115
3.9 INSECTS AND DISEASE	3.138
3.10 TERRESTRIAL WILDLIFE AND WILDLIFE SPECIES	3.144
3.11 INVASIVE SPECIES	3.197
3.12 TIMBER MANAGEMENT AND WOOD PRODUCTS	3.207
3.13 SPECIAL FOREST PRODUCTS	3.224
3.14 RANGELAND MANAGEMENT	3.228

SECTION	PAGE
3.15 MINERALS AND ENERGY: FLUID MINERALS	3.253
3.16 MINERALS AND ENERGY: SOLID MINERALS	3.344
3.17 MINERALS AND ENERGY: GEOTHERMAL ENERGY	3.358
3.18 MINERALS AND ENERGY: ALTERNATIVE ENERGY SOURCES	3.364
3.19 ACCESS AND TRAVEL MANAGEMENT	3.372
3.20 RECREATION	3.390
3.21 HERITAGE AND CULTURAL RESOURCES	3.417
3.22 SCENERY, VISUAL RESOURCES, AND THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT	3.438
3.23 LANDS AND SPECIAL USES	3.456
3.24 UTILITY CORRIDORS AND COMMUNICATIONS SITES	3.463
3.25 ECONOMICS	3.471
3.26 DEMOGRAPHICS	3.493
3.27 LOCAL GOVERNMENTS	3.503
3.28 RESEARCH NATURAL AREAS	3.510
3.29 AREAS OF CRITICAL ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERN	3.515
3.30 PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES	3.528
3.31 SCENIC BYWAYS	3.537
3.32 NATIONAL RECREATION AND SCENIC TRAILS	3.540
3.33 WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS	3.543
3.34 WILDERNESS AND ROADLESS AREAS	3.554
3.35 OTHER FINDINGS	3.569
 CHAPTER 4 ■ PREPARERS	 4.1
 CHAPTER 5 ■ REFERENCES AND GLOSSARY	
5.1 REFERENCES	5.1
5.2 GLOSSARY	5.25

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.1	Acres Managed (by County)	1.2
Table 1.2	Activity Level Plans Developed under the San Juan/San Miguel RMP	1.8
Table 1.3	Plan Components and USFS and BLM Decision Types	1.12
Table 1.4	Overview of Scoping Process	1.17
Table 2.1	Comparison of Management Areas by Alternatives	2.14
Table 2.2	Alternative A Management Area Allocations	2.23
Table 2.3	Alternative B Management Area Allocations	2.28
Table 2.4	Alternative C Management Area Allocations	2.34
Table 2.5	Alternative D Management Area Allocations	2.39
Table 2.6	Oil and Gas Leasing Availability by Alternative on USFS and BLM Lands	2.48
Table 2.7	Oil and Gas Leasing Availability on San Juan Public Lands for Alternative A	2.49
Table 2.8	Oil and Gas Leasing Availability on San Juan Public Lands for Alternative B	2.53
Table 2.9	Oil and Gas Leasing Availability on San Juan Public Lands for Alternative C	2.57
Table 2.10	Oil and Gas Leasing Availability on San Juan Public Lands for Alternative D	2.61
Table 2.11	Oil and Gas Leasing Availability on San Juan Public Lands for the No-leasing Alternative	2.64
Table 2.9.1	(MA 1) - Management Area Allocations	2.66
Table 2.9.1	(MA 2) - Management Area Allocations	2.67
Table 2.9.1	(MA 3) - Management Area Allocations	2.67
Table 2.9.1	(MA 4) - Management Area Allocations	2.68
Table 2.9.1	(MA 5) - Management Area Allocations	2.68
Table 2.9.1	(MA 7) - Management Area Allocations	2.69
Table 2.9.1	(MA 8) - Management Area Allocations	2.69
Table 2.9.2	Resource and Program Management Activities	2.70
Table 2.9.3	Suitable Lands by Alternative	2.71
Table 2.9.4	Special Areas and Unique Landscapes by Alternative	2.72 - 2.75
Table 2.9.5	Other Lands by Alternative	2.76
Table 2.9.6	Oil and Gas Availability by Alternative	2.77 - 2.80
Table 3.1.1	Class I Areas of the Four Corners Region	3.10
Table 3.1.2	Scenic, Important Views on the San Juan Public Lands	3.10
Table 3.1.3	Air Quality Standards, Increments, Significant Impact Levels, and AQRV Criteria	3.14
Table 3.1.4	Background Air Quality and AQRV Data	3.15
Table 3.1.5	Pollutants Common to Oil and Gas Development Emissions	3.18
Table 3.1.6	Near-Field Comparison of Direct Impacts to Ambient Air Quality Standards ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)	3.21

Table 3.1.7	Mid-Field Comparison of Direct and Cumulative Impacts to PSD Class II Increments and Ambient Air Quality Standards (µg/m³)	3.22
Table 3.1.8	Far-Field Comparison of Direct and Cumulative Impacts to PSD Class I Increments and Ambient Air Quality Standards (µg/m³)	3.22
Table 3.1.9	Far-Field Atmospheric Deposition Analysis (kg/ha-yr)	3.23
Table 3.3.1	Waterbodies Classified as Water Quality Impaired	3.41
Table 3.3.2	SJPL Regional and Local Aquifers	3.41
Table 3.3.3	Watersheds with the Highest Road Densities within SJPL (Data Includes Authorized and Unauthorized Roads)	3.44
Table 3.3.4	Watershed Percent of Valley Floor in High Cattle Preference Grazing Areas	3.45
Table 3.3.5	Vegetation Treatments on SJPL	3.46
Table 3.3.6	Greatest Clear-Cut Harvest Areas on SJPL	3.46
Table 3.3.7	Watersheds with the Most Water Diversions	3.48
Table 3.3.8	Largest Reservoirs on SJPL	3.49
Table 3.3.9	Wells on SJPL	3.50
Table 3.3.10	Watersheds Potentially Affected by Oil and Gas Development as a Result of New Leasing Decisions	3.53
Table 3.4.1	Federally Listed Fish Species for SJPL	3.61
Table 3.4.2	USFS and BLM Sensitive Fish Species	3.62
Table 3.4.3	Streams in Southwestern Colorado with Colorado River Cutthroat Trout Conservation Populations	3.62
Table 3.4.4	USFS Management Indicator Species (MIS)	3.63
Table 3.6.1	Current Acreage of the Spruce-Fir Forest Type by Development Stage	3.88
Table 3.6.2	Current Acreage of Aspen Forests by Development Stage	3.89
Table 3.6.3	Current Acreage of the Cool-Moist Mixed-Conifer Forest Type by Development Stage	3.90
Table 3.6.4	Current Acreage of the Warm-Dry Mixed-Conifer Forest Type by Development Stage	3.91
Table 3.6.5	Current Acreage of the Ponderosa Pine Forest Type by Development Stage	3.93
Table 3.6.6	Current Acreage of the Pinyon-Juniper Woodland Type by Development Stage	3.95
Table 3.8.1	Historic Fire Regimes for the SJPL Geographic Area	3.118
Table 3.8.2	Fire Regime Condition Class Descriptions	3.119
Table 3.8.3	Fire Regime Condition Class by Existing Vegetation Type	3.121
Table 3.8.4	Fire Activity 1980-2004, SJPL Geographic Area	3.123
Table 3.8.5	Fuels Treatment Acreage by Cover Type and Method (per year, decade 1)	3.131
Table 3.10.0	SJPL and Region 2 Available Terrestrial Species and Habitat Assessments.	3.150
Table 3.10.1	SJPL T&E Species List and Habitat Description	3.157
Table 3.10.2	SJPL BLM and USFS Sensitive Wildlife Species List and Habitat Association	3.160 - 3.162
Table 3.10.3	USFS Terrestrial Wildlife MIS	3.163
Table 3.10.4	Summary of Findings for SJPL BLM and USFS Sensitive Wildlife Species	3.186
Table 3.11.1	Noxious Weed Inventory on Lands Administered by SJPLC	3.200

Table 3.11.2	Potential Noxious Weed Invaders on Lands Administered by SJPLC	3.201
Table 3.11.3	Priority Noxious Weed Species Scheduled for Treatment Through 2007	3.202
Table 3.12.1	Existing Acres of Suitable Timberland in 1992 Amended Forest Plan	3.209
Table 3.12.2	SJPL Annual Allowable Sale Quantity	3.210
Table 3.12.3	Regeneration Success by Tree Species — 1983 to 2004	3.212
Table 3.12.4	Potential Timber Treatment Acres by Vegetation Type per Year, Decade 1	3.216
Table 3.12.5	Average Annual Harvest Volume	3.223
Table 3.13.1	Special Forest Products in the SJPL Resource Area	3.224
Table 3.14.1	Grazing Allotment Status on Lands Administered by SJPLC	3.236
Table 3.14.2	Current Active AUMs on Lands Administered by the SJPLC	3.236
Table 3.14.3	Suitable Acres of Public Lands Administered by the SJPLC	3.236
Table 3.14.4	Estimated AUMs by Alternative	3.237
Table 3.14.5	Suitable Grazing Acres by Alternative	3.237
Table 3.14.6	Potential AUM Loss Due to New RNA Designations	3.248
Table 3.15.1	Potential for Occurrence of Oil and Gas Resources by Mineral Estate	3.254
Table 3.15.2	Three Stages of Forest Service and BLM Decision-Making Process or Leasing, Exploration, and Development	3.258
Table 3.15.3	Major Oil and Gas Fields in the San Juan Basin Province in the SJPL	3.263
Table 3.15.4	Major Oil and Gas Fields in the Paradox Basin Province	3.264
Table 3.15.5	Major Pipelines in SJPL	3.269
Table 3.15.6	Reasonably Foreseeable Development Scenario for Planning Area - number of wells on all jurisdictions	3.274
Table 3.15.7	Unconstrained (Baseline) Projection of Wells, Well Access Road Miles, and Corresponding Acres Disturbed on USFS Lands in Northern San Juan Basin - 2009-2024	3.275
Table 3.15.8	Unconstrained (Baseline) Projection of Yearly Averages of Wells, Well Access Road Miles, and Corresponding Acres Disturbed on USFS Lands in Northern San Juan Basin - 2009-2024	3.276
Table 3.15.9	Unconstrained (Baseline) Projection of Wells, Well Access Road Miles, and Corresponding Acres Disturbed on BLM Lands in Northern San Juan Basin - 2009-2024	3.277
Table 3.15.10	Unconstrained (Baseline) Projection of Yearly Averages of Wells, Well Access Road Miles, and Corresponding Acres Disturbed on BLM Lands in Northern San Juan Basin - 2009-2024	3.278
Table 3.15.11	Acres Available for Leasing and Acres Not Authorized by Alternative	3.282
Table 3.15.12	Acres Stipulated by Alternative	3.287 - 3.288
Table 3.15.13	Acres of Stipulations by Management Area by Alternative	3.295 - 3.306
Table 3.15.14	Management Area 1	3.308 - 3.309
Table 3.15.15	Effects of Management Area 1 on Oil and Gas Development Based on the Reasonably Foreseeable Development Scenario as a result of Management Area 1 Application	3.311
Table 3.15.16	Stipulations Within Management Area 2	3.312 - 3.314
Table 3.15.17	Effects of Management Area 2 Application on Oil and Gas Development Based on the Reasonably Foreseeable Development Scenario	3.315
Table 3.15.18	Stipulations Within Management Area 3	3.316

Table 3.15.19	Effects of Management Area 3 Application on Oil and Gas Development Based on the Reasonably Foreseeable Development Scenario	3.317
Table 3.15.20	Stipulations Within Management Area 4	3.318
Table 3.15.21	Effects of Management Area 4 Application on Oil and Gas Development Based on the Reasonably Foreseeable Development Scenario	3.319
Table 3.15.22	Stipulations Within Management Area 5	3.320
Table 3.15.23	Effects of Management Area 5 Application on Oil and Gas Development Based on the Reasonably Foreseeable Development Scenario	3.321
Table 3.15.24	Stipulations Within Management Area 7	3.322
Table 3.15.25	Effects of Management Area 7 Application on Oil and Gas Development Based on the Reasonably Foreseeable Development Scenario	3.323
Table 3.15.26	Stipulations Within Management Area 8	3.324
Table 3.15.27	Effects of Management Area 8 Application on Oil and Gas Development Based on the Reasonably Foreseeable Development Scenario	3.325
Table 3.15.28	Acres with Stipulations for Wildlife Species	3.327 - 3.328
Table 3.15.29	Effects of Fish and Wildlife Management on Oil and Gas Development Based on the Reasonably Foreseeable Development Scenario	3.328
Table 3.15.30	Acreage with Heritage Resource Stipulations by Alternative	3.329
Table 3.15.31	Effects of Heritage Resource Management on Oil and Gas Development Based on the Reasonably Foreseeable Development Scenario	3.330
Table 3.15.32	Acreage with Vegetation Stipulations by Alternative	3.331
Table 3.15.33	Effects of Vegetation Management on Oil and Gas Development Based on the Reasonably Foreseeable Development Scenario	3.331
Table 3.15.34	Acres with Stipulations for Recreation by Alternative	3.332
Table 3.15.35	Effects of Recreation Management on Oil and Gas Development Based on the Reasonably Foreseeable Development Scenario	3.333
Table 3.15.36	Acreage with Scenic Integrity Stipulation by Alternative	3.334
Table 3.15.37	Effects of Scenery Management on Oil and Gas Development Based on the Reasonably Foreseeable Development Scenario	3.335
Table 3.15.38	Acreage with Soils Stipulations by Alternative	3.336
Table 3.15.39	Effects of Soil Management on Oil and Gas Development Based on the Reasonably Foreseeable Development Scenario	3.337
Table 3.15.40	Acreage with a Water Management Stipulation by Alternative	3.338
Table 3.15.41	Effects of Water Management on Oil and Gas Development Based on the Reasonably Foreseeable Development Scenario	3.338
Table 3.15.42	Effects of Alternatives on Oil and Gas Development as a Result of Not Available and NSO Stipulations - Based on the Reasonably Foreseeable Development Scenario	3.340
Table 3.15.43	NSO Stipulations by Acres	3.341 - 3.343
Table 3.16.1	SJPL Areas Favorable for Solid Minerals and Mineral Activity	3.346
Table 3.16.2	Environmental Effects to Solid Minerals by Alternative	3.355
Table 3.17.1	Environmental Impacts Related to Geothermal Energy by Alternative	3.361

Table 3.18.1	BLM Planning Areas in Colorado with High Potential for Wind or Biomass Renewable Power	3.365
Table 3.19.1	SJPLC Road Miles	3.375
Table 3.19.2	SJPL Road Miles by Functional Class	3.376
Table 3.19.3	Federally Designated Forest Highways	3.377
Table 3.19.4	Estimated Funding Needs for SJNF Road Maintenance and Operations	3.377
Table 3.19.5	Estimated Route Density by Alternative with Full Implementation of Route Density Guidelines	3.381
Table 3.19.6	Approximate Change in Designated Road and Motorized Trail Mileage by Alternative	3.383 - 3.385
Table 3.19.7	Summary of Direct and Indirect Impacts by Alternative	3.387
Table 3.20.1	Tourism by Geographic Area (Dolores)	3.394
Table 3.20.2	Tourism by Geographic Area (Pagosa)	3.395
Table 3.20.3	Tourism by Geographic Area (Columbine)	3.396
Table 3.21.1	Tribes and Pueblos with cultural ties or interests in the planning area	3.421
Table 3.22.1	Existing Scenic and Visual Resource Condition – Percent of Total Area	3.440
Table 3.22.2	Scenic Condition by Alternative (Percentage of Total SJPL Acres)	3.448
Table 3.22.3	Natural Appearing Landscape by Alternative (Percentage of Total SJPL Acres)	3.448
Table 3.22.4	Direct Impacts Related to Well Development	3.452
Table 3.22.5	Cumulative Impacts Related to Oil and Gas Development	3.454
Table 3.23.1	Environmental Impacts to Lands by Alternative	3.461
Table 3.24.1	Transmission Lines and Streams	3.467
Table 3.24.2	Electronic and Communication Sites in Planning Area	3.468
Table 3.25.1	Employment by Major Industry, 2004	3.472
Table 3.25.2	Labor Earnings by Major Industry, 2004	3.473
Table 3.25.3	Projected Changes in Employment Associated with SJPL by Program by Alternative in 2015 (jobs)	3.486
Table 3.25.4	Projected Changes in Employment Associated with SJPL by Major Industry by Alternative in 2015 (jobs)	3.487
Table 3.25.5	Projected Changes in Labor income Associated with SJPL by Program by Alternative in 2015 (\$ thousand)	3.488
Table 3.25.6	Projected Changes in Labor Income Associated with SJPLC by Major Industry by Alternative in 2015 (\$ thousand)	3.489
Table 3.25.7	Estimated Cumulative Impacts Related to Employment and Labor Income by Alternative for SJPL	3.490
Table 3.25.8	Economic and Financial Efficiency by Alternative	3.492
Table 3.26.1	Percent of Population by Minority Status for Colorado and San Juan-area Counties, 2000	3.497
Table 3.26.2	Percent of Population by Ethnic Status for Colorado and San Juan-area Counties, 2000	3.497
Table 3.26.3	Affiliated Tribes	3.498
Table 3.26.4	Percentage of Families below the Poverty Level	3.499
Table 3.27.1	Federal Payment in Lieu of Taxes (PILT) 2006	3.504

Table 3.27.2	Payments to Counties 2006	3.505
Table 3.27.3	Payments from Energy Development Revenues in 2006	3.505
Table 3.27.4	County Property Tax Revenues for 2005	3.506
Table 3.27.5	Oil and Gas Assessed Valuation vs. Total Assessed Valuation for 2005	3.506
Table 3.28.1	Potential and Existing RNAs	3.511
Table 3.29.1	Potential Areas of Critical Environmental Concern	3.519 - 3.520
Table 3.33.1	Stream Segments with Outstandingly Remarkable Values (ORVs)	3.547
Table 3.34.1	Roadless Areas Inventoried	3.559
Table 3.34.2	Wilderness Characteristics	3.560
Table 3.34.3	Roadless Areas Capable of and Available for Wilderness Recommendation	3.561
Table 3.34.4	Need Evaluation	3.562
Table 3.34.5	Roadless Acres in Management Areas by Alternative	3.564
Table 3.34.6	Implications for Wilderness and Roadless by Management Area Group	3.564
Table 3.34.7	Distribution of Roadless Acres by Management Area Groups by Alternative	3.565

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.1	San Juan Public Lands - Planning Area	1.3
Figure 2.1	Management Areas Alternative A	2.15
Figure 2.2	Management Areas Alternative B	2.16
Figure 2.3	Management Areas Alternative C	2.17
Figure 2.4	Management Areas Alternative D	2.18
Figure 2.5	Over Ground Motorized Suitability - Alternative A	2.25
Figure 2.6	Over Snow Motorized Suitability - Alternative A	2.26
Figure 2.7	Over Ground Motorized Suitability - Alternative B	2.30
Figure 2.8	Over Snow Motorized Suitability - Alternative B	2.31
Figure 2.9	Over Ground Motorized Suitability - Alternative C	2.35
Figure 2.10	Over Snow Motorized Suitability - Alternative C	
Figure 2.11	Over Ground Motorized Suitability - Alternative D	2.40
Figure 2.12	Over Snow Motorized Suitability - Alternative D	2.41
Figure 2.13	Oil and Gas Leasing Availability and Stipulations for Alternative A	2.51
Figure 2.14	Oil and Gas Leasing Availability and Stipulations for Alternative B	2.55
Figure 2.15	Oil and Gas Leasing Availability and Stipulations for Alternative C	2.59
Figure 2.16	Oil and Gas Leasing Availability and Stipulations for Alternative D	2.63

Figure 3.1.1	Annual Mean Temperature Change for Northern Latitudes (24 - 90° N)	3.17
Figure 3.3.1	Lewis and Mancos Shale in HUC 4 Watersheds	3.42
Figure 3.6.1	Major Vegetation Types	3.87
Figure 3.8.1	Fire Regimes	3.117
Figure 3.8.2	Fire Conditions Class	3.120
Figure 3.8.3	Fire Activity 1980-2004, SJPL Geographic Area	3.124
Figure 3.8.4	Wildland Urban Interface (WUI)	3.126
Figure 3.8.5	Fire Management Emphasis	3.128
Figure 3.12.1	Acres Harvested by Silviculture Method on the SJNF, 1955 through 2004	3.211
Figure 3.12.2	Fuelwood Harvest	3.213
Figure 3.12.3	Volume of Timber Sold and Harvested on the SJNF (1984-2003)	3.214
Figure 3.12.4	Timber Suitability Alternative A	3.218
Figure 3.12.5	Timber Suitability Alternative B	3.219
Figure 3.12.6	Timber Suitability Alternative C	3.220
Figure 3.12.7	Timber Suitability Alternative D	3.221
Figure 3.14.1	Comparative Stocking Rates - Alternative A	3.232
Figure 3.14.2	Comparative Stocking Rates - Alternative B	3.233
Figure 3.14.3	Comparative Stocking Rates - Alternative C	3.234
Figure 3.14.4	Comparative Stocking Rates - Alternative D	3.235
Figure 3.14.5	Lands Suitable and Available for Cattle Grazing - Alternative A	3.238
Figure 3.14.6	Lands Suitable and Available for Sheep Grazing - Alternative A	3.239
Figure 3.14.7	Lands Suitable and Available for Cattle Grazing - Alternative b	3.240
Figure 3.14.8	Lands Suitable and Available for Sheep Grazing - Alternative B	3.241
Figure 3.14.9	Lands Suitable and Available for Cattle Grazing - Alternative C	3.242
Figure 3.14.10	Lands Suitable and Available for Sheep Grazing - Alternative C	3.243
Figure 3.14.11	Lands Suitable and Available for Cattle Grazing - Alternative D	3.244
Figure 3.14.12	Lands Suitable and Available for Sheep Grazing - Alternative D	3.245
Figure 3.15.1	Favorable Oil and Gas Resource Potential Summary and Potential High Development Areas	3.255
Figure 3.15.2	Annual Oil Production in RFD Area	3.267
Figure 3.15.3	Non CO2 Gas Production in RFD	3.268
Figure 3.15.4	Annual CO2 Production in RFD Area	3.269
Figure 3.15.6	Oil and Gas Leasing Stipulations Alternative A	3.290
Figure 3.15.7	Oil and Gas Leasing Stipulations Alternative B	3.291
Figure 3.15.8	Oil and Gas Leasing Stipulations Alternative C	3.292
Figure 3.15.9	Oil and Gas Leasing Stipulations Alternative D	3.293

Figure 3.18.1	Concentrating Solar Resource	3.367
Figure 3.18.2	Wind Resource Analysis Results	3.368
Figure 3.18.3	Biomass Analysis Results	3.369
Figure 3. 20.1	Summer Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (ROS) Alternative A	3.402
Figure 3.20.2	Summer Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (ROS) Alternative B	3.403
Figure 3.20.3	Summer Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (ROS) Alternative C	3.404
Figure 3.20.4	Summer Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (ROS) Alternative D	3.405
Figure 3.20.5	Winter Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (ROS) Alternative A	3.407
Figure 3.20.6	Winter Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (ROS) Alternative B	3.408
Figure 3.20.7	Winter Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (ROS) Alternative C	3.409
Figure 3.20.8	Winter Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (ROS) Alternative D	3.410
Figure 3.22.1	Scenic Integrity Objectives and Visual Resource Management (VRM) Classes Alternative A	3.444
Figure 3.22.2	Scenic Integrity Objectives and Visual Resource Management (VRM) Classes Alternative B	3.445
Figure 3.22.3	Scenic Integrity Objectives and Visual Resource Management (VRM) Classes Alternative C	3.446
Figure 3.22.4	Scenic Integrity Objectives and Visual Resource Management (VRM) Classes Alternative D	3.447
Figure 3.24.1	Major Oil and Gas and Electrical Transmission Lines	3.464
Figure 3.24.2	Designated Utility Corridors, and Electronic and Communication Sites in Planning Area	3.466
Figure 3.25.1	Personal Income by Source by Region, 2005 (percent)	3.474
Figure 3.25.2	Personal Income Forecast by Source for San Juan Area, 2000-2035 (dollars)	3.475
Figure 3.25.3	Personal Income Forecast by Source for San Juan Area, 2000-2035 (percent)	3.475
Figure 3.25.4	Cost of living index for Colorado Counties, 2001	3.478
Figure 3.25.6	Jobs Generated By Spending Source in the San Juan Area Economy, 2004	3.479
Figure 3.25.7	Labor Income Generated by Spending Source in the San Juan Area Economy, 2004 (\$million)	3.480
Figure 3.25.8	Jobs Generated by Spending Source with SJPL Operations in the San Juan Area Economy, 2004	3.481
Figure 3.25.9	Labor Income Generated by Spending Source with SJPL Operations in the San Juan Area Economy, 2004 (\$million)	3.482
Figure 3.25.10	Jobs by Industry Supported by SJPL Operations and Other Export-Based Activities in the San Juan Area Economy, 2004	3.483
Figure 3.25.11	Labor Income by Industry Supported by SJPL Operations and Other Export-Based Activities in the San Juan Area eEconomy, 2004 (\$million)	3.484
Figure 3.26.1	U.S. Regions Share of Total Population	3.494
Figure 3.26.2	Aggregate Population in 6 County SJPL Area	3.494
Figure 3.26.3	Age Structure SJPL Area and U.S.	3.495
Figure 3.26.4	Net Migration 1985-2005	3.495
Figure 3.26.5	Migration Rate of Change in the SJPL Area	3.496

Figure 3.26.6	Occupancy Status in SJPL Area	3.496
Figure 3.26.7	NwCOG Resident Homeowner Survey: “Why do you live here?”	3.500
Figure 3.26.8	NwCOG Second Home Owner Survey: “Why did you purchase your home?”	3.500
Figure 3.27.5	Oil and Gas as Share of 2005 Total Property Tax Base – SJPL Area	3.507
Figure 3.29.1	ACECs Alternative A	3.523
Figure 3.29.2	ACECs Alternative B	3.524
Figure 3.29.3	ACECs Alternative C	3.525
Figure 3.33.1	Wild and Scenic River (WSR) Segments under Alternative A	3.550
Figure 3.33.2	Wild and Scenic River (WSR) Segments under Alternative B	3.551
Figure 3.33.3	Wild and Scenic River (WSR) Segments under Alternative C	3.552
Figure 3.34.1	Recommended Wilderness Alternative B	3.556
Figure 3.34.2	Recommended Wilderness Alternative C	3.557